



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,591	04/17/2001	Todd R. Hayes	19789.00	8202

37833 7590 06/01/2004

LITMAN LAW OFFICES, LTD.
P.O. BOX 15035 CRYSTAL CITY STATION
ARLINGTON, VA 22215

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/835,591	Applicant(s) HAYES, TODD R.	
	Examiner James H Blackwell	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2001.
 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renshaw (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,024) in view of Chang et al. (hereinafter Chang, U.S. Patent No. 6,584,479) and in further view of Lyness (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,842).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Renshaw teaches in Fig. 2, there is shown a web Browser (200) having Java capability, a so-called Java-capable browser, used to access html documents or web pages stored for example, on an Internet server (205) (alternatively the html documents may be stored on a server accessible via any other suitable network, such as an intranet, local area network, etc) (Col. 4, lines 20-26; compare with Claim 1, “... ***a client computer means for the plurality of users to access the system***”). Renshaw also teaches an Internet server (205) contains at least two HTML documents (210) and (215), both containing HTML instructions to be rendered to the screen of the computer system running the Java-capable browser (Col. 4, lines 28-31; compare with Claim 1, “... ***a server computer means for providing the plurality of users with the online HTML document, said client computer means communicating with said server computer means over a computer network, such as the Internet***”). Renshaw does not specifically teach *an interactive interface*

comprising: a display frame with a static HTML layer for pop-up footnotes, graphics and ad banners. However, Chang teaches in Fig. 2, a flat panel display (14) (previously illustrated in Fig. 1) presents a computer-controlled graphical and textual display (40) to a user. The display (40) is created by negotiation (using negotiation module (36), a software module executing on computer (20) of Fig. 1) between a primary body of data (represented by box (34)) and a supporting body of data (generally represented by box (32), with supporting data derived from various sources of data (62), (64), or (66)). As can be seen with reference to Fig. 2, the display (40) includes text (48) and graphics (46), tables (50), and various annotation tags (including annotation tag (52)) (Col. 5, lines 15-28; compare with Claim 1, “... ***an interactive interface comprising: a display frame with a static HTML layer for pop-up footnotes, graphics and ad banners***”). Chang also teaches that the annotation tag (52) (which is associated with textual data from one of sources of data (62), (64), or (66)) can be selected by moving a mouse operated cursor (58) into a region of user focus (59), initiating an animated launch sequence that results in display of a “callout” textual annotation (56) (Col. 5, lines 26-31; compare with Claim 1, “... ***a scrolling text frame for holding a text of the document and hyperlinks to activate pop-up footnotes and ad banners in the display frame***”). Chang does not specifically teach a *title navigation frame, which includes links to other chapters and segments of the document* or a *custom client frame, which is a frame that is designed to a customer's specification includes links to a customer's Web pages*. However, Lyness teaches easy user navigation of a hierarchically organized set of pages at a large web site, as illustrated in Fig. 18. The small display area demanded

by the invention to navigate a hierarchy of any size can be placed in a "navigation frame" of a browser window, allowing the user to browse the site and from there control the content of a larger "main frame" of the window. More generally, the invention can be likewise be applied to allow easy user navigation of any hierarchically organized set of web pages that may reside in a large number of different sites. For such purposes, a node-specific action places the web page advertised by the selected node in the main frame (Col. 15, lines 46-52; compare with Claim 1, "**... a title navigation frame, which includes links to other chapters and segments of the document**" and "**... a custom client frame, which is a frame that is designed to a customer's specification includes links to a customer's Web pages**"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Renshaw, Chang, and Lyness providing the benefit of easier layout and navigation of web page information with enhanced content for the user.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renshaw in view of Chang and in further view of Lyness and in further view of Ono et al. (hereinafter Ono, U.S. Patent No. 6,742,163).

In regard to dependent Claim 2, Renshaw does not teach *an identifying HTML address code comprises a document identifier, chapter and segment identifier and a custom client identifier*. However, Ono teaches that it is possible to determine whether a page is the top page or not from an address of URL. Normally, URL of the top page assumes a shape of "http://aa.bbb" or "http://aaa.bbb/index.html". Here, "bbb" is what is

used in Japan and is prescribed as "co.jp" for companies, as "ac.jp" for academies and as "or.jp" for public organizations for example. A sub-page has a form of "http://aaa.bbb/cdd/ddd/eee.html". An area delimited by "/" . . . "/" is called a directory in general. It can be seen that URL of the sub-page is located at the position that is lower by two directories from the URL of the top page in the above example (Col. 15, lines 1-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Renshaw, Chang, Lyness, and Ono providing the benefit of determining a hierarchy from the format of a URL.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang.

In regard to independent Claim 3, Chang teaches that as can be seen with reference to Fig. 2, the display (40) includes text (48) and graphics (46), tables (50), and various annotation tags (including annotation tag (52)). The annotation tag (52) (which is associated with textual data from one of sources of data (62), (64), or (66)) can be selected by moving a mouse-operated cursor (58) into a region of user focus (59), initiating an animated launch sequence that results in display of a "callout" textual annotation (56). The expansion animation typically takes anywhere from about a quarter second to about two seconds, sufficient for allowing a user to keep visual track of the expanding annotation and maintain proper contextual focus. When user focus changes by movement of the mouse cursor, the annotation tag is replaced and the primary body of data reverts to its original format by a reverse, contracting animation. As will be

appreciated, the animation speed can be fully controllable, with high speed "pop-up" display annotations being presented for brief annotations, and longer animations being used for more complex annotations positioned far from the annotation tag (Col. 5, lines 24-42; compare with Claim 3, **"... displaying a dormant title image in the display frame; rolling a cursor from a pointing device over a hyperlink in the scrolling text frame; displaying a footnote and an ad banner in the display frame; (pop-up) rolling a cursor from a pointing device off of a hyperlink in the scrolling text frame; and displaying a dormant title image again in the display frame"**). Thus, while Chang does not specifically teach frames, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to conclude that one way to display the content of a number of related web pages simultaneously is by the use of frames. The benefit would have been to enable easier inter-web page interactions.

In regard to independent Claim 4, Claim 4 substantially reflects the method of Claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale. In addition, Chang teaches that the annotation tag can be primarily textual, primarily graphical, or some mixture of textual and graphical elements. Contemplated annotation tags include numeric tags (e.g. footnote numerals), greeked or unreadably small interlinear or marginal text, symbols (e.g. an asterisk), hypertext links, or thumbnail graphics or drawings in the margin (Col. 1, lines 65-67; Col. 2, lines 1-4; compare with Claim 4, **"... clicking on the hyperlink in the scrolling text frame; and opening a new window over the interactive interface containing a web site providing supplementary information"**).


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
04/25/04


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER